

REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action of June 16, 2005 has been received and its contents reviewed. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the consideration given to the above-identified application, and for indicating claims 2-5, 10, 11 and 13 as containing allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By the above actions, claims 2-5 and 10-13 have been amended, independent claims 1 and 9 have been cancelled, and new claims 17-20 have been added. Accordingly, claims 2-8 and 10-20 are pending for consideration, of which claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 are now independent, and claims 6 and 14 are still independent. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is now requested.

Claims 9-16 stand objected to because of the following informalities as noted by the Examiner: in claim 9, line 5, "surface" should read --surfaces--, in line 13, --being configured-- should be inserted after "means" and in line 19, a semi-colon (;) should be inserted at the end of the line; in claim 14, line 5, "the superimposed surface" should read --superimposed surfaces--, and in line 15, "is" should read --being configured--. In response, Applicant has incorporated the features of claim 9 into claims 10 and 11 with the amendment to the amended portions as suggested by the Examiner. Further, Applicant has amended claim 14, as shown above, as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Particularly, claims 1, 6, 9 and 14 recite the limitation "the distal end of the junction tool" in lines 11, 13, 15-16 and 18, respectively. The Examiner asserted that there is no antecedent basis for this feature. To overcome this rejection Applicant has amended the appropriate portions of claims 1 and 9, which have been incorporated into claims 2-3 and 10-11, to change "distal end portion of the junction tool" to "pin of the first tool" as shown in amended claims 2 and 10, and to change "distal end portion of the junction tool" to "pin of the first tool and the convex portion of the second tool", as shown in amended claims 3 and 11 and claims 6 and 14.

Claims 1, 9 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Seiji et al. (JP 202-066760). In view of the amendments set forth above to incorporate all of the features of claims 1 and 9 into 2-3 and 10-11, respectively, this rejection is now rendered as moot.

With respect to claims 6-8 and 14-16, Applicant has amended the claims, as shown above to overcome the §112, second paragraph, rejection set forth in this Office Action.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all the pending rejections and objections.

New dependent claims have been added to further complete the scope to which Applicant is entitled. Claims 17-20 parallel claims 4, 5, 12 and 13, respectively.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicant's representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,



Luan C. Do
Reg. No. 38,434

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000